OMB Approval Number: 2050-0095
Approved for Use Through: 4/95

FILE COPY

150848

Site Name: Ucinite Corp/DOT Corp.
CERCLIS ID No.: MAD985300805
Street Address: 320 Nevada St/459 Watertown St.
City/State/Zip: Newton, MA 02160

Investigator: Catherine Gabis
Agency/Organization: TRC Companies
Street Address: Boott Mills South
City/State: Lowell, MA

Date: 12/25/92

OMB Approval Number: 2050-0095
Approved for Use Through: 4/95

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: MA	CERCLIS Number: MAD985300805
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92	

1. General Site Information

Name:	Street Address:
Ucinite Corp/DOT Corp.	320 Nevada St/459 Watertown St.

City:	State:	Zip Code:	County:	Co. Code:	Cong. Dist:
Newton	MA	02160	Middlesex	017	04

Latitude:	Longitude:	Approx. Area of Site:	Status of Site:
71 12′ 30.0"	42 21′ 15.0"	5 acres	Active

2. Owner/Operator Information

Owner:	Operator:
Mr. Joseph Biotti, Sr.	Mr. Joseph Biotti, Sr.
Street Address: 97 Adams Street	Street Address: Rear 101 Adams Street
City: Newton	City: Newton

State:	Zip Code:	Telephone:	State:	Zip Code:	Telephone:
MA	02159	617-332-8346	MA	02159	617-332-8346

Type of Ownership:	How Initially Identified:
Private	State/Local Program

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION State: MA CERCLIS Number: MAD985300805 CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92

3. Site Evaluator Information

Name of Evaluator:	Agency/Organization:	Date Prepared:
Catherine Gabis	TRC Companies	12/25/92

Street Address:	City:	State:
Boott Mills South	Lowell	MA

Name of EPA or State Agency Contact:	Telephone:
Ms. Sharon Hayes	617-573-5709

Street Address:	City:	State:
JFK Federal Building	Boston	MA

4. Site Disposition (for EPA use only)

Emergency Response/Removal Assessment Recommendation: No Date:	CERCLIS Recommendation: Higher Priority SI Date:	Signature: Name: Position:

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS

WASTE SITE

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM

IDENTIFICATION

State:	CERCLIS Number:
MA	MAD985300805

CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92

5. General Site Characteristics

Predominant Land Uses Within 1 Mile of Site:
- Industrial
- Commercial
- Residential

Site Setting: Urban

Years of Operation:
- Beginning Year: 1938
- Ending Year: 1992

Type of Site Operations:
- Manufacturing
  - Plastic and/or Rubber Products
  - Metal Coatings, Plating, Engraving
  - Metal Forging, Stamping
- RCRA
  - Large Quantity Generator

Waste Generated: Onsite

Waste Deposition Authorized By: Former Owner

Waste Accessible to the Public: No

Distance to Nearest Dwelling, School, or Workplace: 5 Feet

6. Waste Characteristics Information

Source Type	Quantity		Tier
Contaminated soil	9.40e+01	cu ft	V
Non-drum containers	1.50e+03	gals	V
Contaminated soil	2.00e+01	cu yds	V
Contaminated soil	1.00e+00	cu yds	V
Non-drum containers	7.00e+02	gals	V

General Types of Waste:
- Metals
- Organics
- Inorganics
- Solvents
- Acids/Bases

Physical State of Waste as Deposited
- Liquid
- Sludge
- Powder

Tier Legend
- C = Constituent W = Wastestream
- V = Volume A = Area

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: MA	CERCLIS Number: MAD985300805
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92	

7. Ground Water Pathway

Is Ground Water Used for Drinking Water Within 4 Miles: ~~No~~ Yes (error)	Is There a Suspected Release to Ground Water: Yes	List Secondary Target Population Served by Ground Water Withdrawn From:
Type of Ground Water Wells Within 4 Miles: Municipal Private	Have Primary Target Drinking Water Wells Been Identified: No	0 - 1/4 Mile 3 >1/4 - 1/2 Mile 0 >1/2 - 1 Mile 11 >1 - 2 Miles 34 >2 - 3 Miles 35 >3 - 4 Miles 10029 Total 10112
Depth to Shallowest Aquifer: 5 Feet		
Karst Terrain/Aquifer Present: No	Nearest Designated Wellhead Protection Area: >0 - 4 Miles	

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION State: MA CERCLIS Number: MAD985300805 CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 1 of 4

Type of Surface Water Draining Site and 15 Miles Downstream:	Shortest Overland Distance From Any Source to Surface Water:
River Other: Storm drains	100 Feet 0.0 Miles
Is there a Suspected Release to Surface Water: Yes	Site is Located in: > 500 yr floodplain

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 2 of 4

Drinking Water Intakes Along the Surface Water Migration Path: No

Have Primary Target Drinking Water Intakes Been Identified: No

Secondary Target Drinking Water Intakes:
None

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION
	State: MA | CERCLIS Number: MAD985300805
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 3 of 4

Fisheries Located Along the Surface Water Migration Path: Yes

Have Primary Target Fisheries Been Identified: No

Secondary Target Fisheries:

Fishery Name	Water Body Type/Flow(cfs)
Charles River	moderate-large stream/ >100-1000
Boston Harbor	Coastal,ocean,Gr.Lakes

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 4 of 4

Wetlands Located Along the Surface Water Migration Path? (y/n) Yes

Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Identified? (y/n) No

Secondary Target Wetlands:

Water Body/Flow(cfs)	Frontage(mi)
minimal stream/ <10	0.1 to 1

Other Sensitive Environments Along the Surface Water Migration Path: No

Have Primary Target Sensitive Environments Been Identified: No

Secondary Target Sensitive Environments:
None

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION State: MA CERCLIS Number: MAD985300805 CERCLIS Discovery Date: 1/08/92

9. Soil Exposure Pathway

Are People Occupying Residences or Attending School or Daycare on or Within 200 Feet of Areas of Known or Suspected Contamination: Yes Total Resident Population: 12	Number of Workers Onsite: 101 - 1000

Have Terrestrial Sensitive Environments Been Identified on or Within 200 Feet of Areas of Known or Suspected Contamination: No

10. Air Pathway

Total Population on or Within:		Is There a Suspected Release to Air: No	
Onsite	320	Wetlands Located Within 4 Miles of the Site: Yes	
0 - 1/4 Mile	946		
>1/4 - 1/2 Mile	2898		
>1/2 - 1 Mile	12900		
>1 - 2 Miles	53768	Other Sensitive Environments Located Within 4 Miles of the Site: No	
>2 - 3 Miles	80584		
>3 - 4 Miles	102826		
Total	254242		

Sensitive Environments Within 1/2 Mile of the Site:

Distance	Sensitive Environment Type/Wetlands Area(acres)
0 - 1/4	Wetlands (1 to 50 acres)

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Waste Characteristics (WC) Calculations:

1 Cistern	Contaminated soil	Ref:1,8,9	WQ value	maximum
Volume	9.40E+01 cu ft		1.39E-03	1.39E-03

A brick cistern or well, 2.5 feet square and 15 feet deep was excavated and the contaminated soil/sludge was removed from the site.

15 x 2.5 x 2.5= 93.75 cu. feet.
Ref: 1,8,9

2 TCE Aboveground tank	Non-drum containers	Ref:1,8,9	WQ value	maximum
Volume	1.50E+03 gals		3.00E+00	3.00E+00

A 1,500 gallon TCE tank was located adjacent to the Mill Building on the property. It was cleaned and removed from the property in March, 1983 by Cecos International Inc.
Ref: 7,9

3 Electroplating Room	Contaminated soil	Ref:1,8,9	WQ value	maximum
Volume	2.00E+01 cu yds		8.00E-03	8.00E-03

Waste from the electroplating room was sealed in a 20 cubic yard roll-off container during decontamination processes in March, 1983. The container held asbestos and cyanide contaminated concrete and dust sandblasted and chipped from the walls of the electroplating room.
Ref: 7,8,9

4 Electroplating Drain	Contaminated soil	Ref: 10	WQ value	maximum
Volume	1.00E+00 cu yds		4.00E-04	4.00E-04

An unknown amount of contaminated soil was removed from the drains in the electroplatiing rooms. The drains were then filled with peastone and sealed.
Ref: 10

5 Cistern	Non-drum containers	Ref:1,8,9	WQ value	maximum
Volume	7.00E+02 gals		1.40E+00	1.40E+00

The 2.5x2.5x15 foot cistern located in the former electroplating room was pumped dry and then sealed. Seven hundred gallons of t-1,2 dichloroethene (DCE) contaminated water (2000 ppb) were removed from the property.
Ref: 1,7,8

WQ total 4.41E+00

** Only First WC Page Is Printed ** | Waste Characteristics Score: WC = 18

Ground Water Pathway Criteria List
Suspected Release

Are sources poorly contained? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the source a type likely to contribute to ground water contamination (e.g., wet lagoon)? (y/n/u)	Y
Is waste quantity particularly large? (y/n/u)	N
Is precipitation heavy? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the infiltration rate high? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the site located in an area of karst terrain? (y/n)	N
Is the subsurface highly permeable or conductive? (y/n/u)	N
Is drinking water drawn from a shallow aquifer? (y/n/u)	N
Are suspected contaminants highly mobile in ground water? (y/n/u)	Y
Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest ground water contamination? (y/n/u)	Y

Other criteria? (y/n) N

SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n) Y

Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:

Analytical data collected in November, 1982 by EG&G Consultants, Inc. documented contamination of several groundwater monitoring wells, as well as an onsite contact wash water well. Contaminants in groundwater included trichloroethylene, vinyl chloride, methylene chloride, t-1,2-dichloroethylene, copper, mercury, cadmium, zinc, chromium, nickel, silver, lead, beryllium and phenolics. These wastes were documented in a Preliminary Assessment and Site Inspection conducted by the MADEQE in 1984.

Ref: 1,7,8,21

Ground Water Pathway Criteria List
Primary Targets

Is any drinking water well nearby? (y/n/u)	N
Has any nearby drinking water well been closed? (y/n/u)	N
Has any nearby drinking water well user reported foul-testing or foul-smelling water? (y/n/u)	N
Does any nearby well have a large drawdown/high production rate? (y/n/u)	Y
Is any drinking water well located between the site and other wells that are suspected to be exposed to a hazardous substance? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest contamination at a drinking water well? (y/n/u)	N
Does any drinking water well warrant sampling? (y/n/u)	N

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY TARGET(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Targets:

None identified.

The nearest drinking water well is located 0.25 miles southeast of the site. The nearest municipal drinking water well is located 3.75 miles southwest of the site. No record of well contamination was discovered.

Ref: 1,2,4,7.8

GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/n)	Yes	
Is the site located in karst terrain? (y/n)	No	16
Depth to aquifer (feet):	5	12,23
Distance to the nearest drinking water well (feet):	1320	2

LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
1. SUSPECTED RELEASE	550		
2. NO SUSPECTED RELEASE		0	
LR =	550	0	

Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		
4. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION Are any wells part of a blended system? (y/n) Y	135	0	
5. NEAREST WELL	20	0	
6. WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREA >0 - 4 Miles	5	0	error: 5,6
7. RESOURCES	5	0	
T =	165	0	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS		
WC =	18	0

GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	20

Ground Water Target Populations

Primary Target Population Drinking Water Well ID	Dist. (miles)	Population Served	Reference	Value
None				
*** Note : Maximum of 5 Wells Are Printed ***			Total	

Secondary Target Population Distance Categories	Population Served	Reference	Value
0 to 1/4 mile	3	2,4	1
Greater than 1/4 to 1/2 mile	0	2,4	0
Greater than 1/2 to 1 mile	11	2,4	1
Greater than 1 to 2 miles	34	2,4,22	1
Greater than 2 to 3 miles	35	2,4,22	1
Greater than 3 to 4 miles	10029	2,5,22	131
		Total	135

Apportionment Documentation for a Blended System

Wellesley, MA has five municipal wells, each equally serving 25,000 customers. Two of these wells are located 3.75 miles southwest of the property.

Two wells = 40% of total. 25,000 x 40% = 10,000 customers served.

The wells are located in a Wellhead Protection Area.

Ref: 4,5,6

Surface Water Pathway Criteria List
Suspected Release

Is surface water nearby? (y/n/u)	Y
Is waste quantity particularly large? (y/n/u)	N
Is the drainage area large? (y/n/u)	Y
Is rainfall heavy? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the infiltration rate low? (y/n/u)	N
Are sources poorly contained or prone to runoff or flooding? (y/n/u)	N
Is a runoff route well defined(e.g.ditch/channel to surf.water)? (y/n/u)	Y
Is vegetation stressed along the probable runoff path? (y/n/u)	N
Are sediments or water unnaturally discolored? (y/n/u)	N
Is wildlife unnaturally absent? (y/n/u)	N
Has deposition of waste into surface water been observed? (y/n/u)	N
Is ground water discharge to surface water likely? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical/circumstantial evidence suggest S.W. contam? (y/n/u)	Y
Other criteria? (y/n)	Y
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	Y

Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:

Soil samples collected at the property have been shown to be contaminated with cadmium, copper, lead, zinc, chromium, nickel, TCE, methylene cholride, and phenolics. These samples were collected adjacent to a wetland and what remains of Silver Lake. There are also several storm drains that channel surface runoff into the municipl system. Surface water runs either into Silver Lake and drains internally, or into storm drains leading to the Charles River, 2000 feet to the northeast.

Ref: 1,7,8,23

Surface Water Pathway Criteria List
Primary Targets

Is any target nearby? (y/n/u) If yes: Y
- N Drinking water intake
- Y Fishery
- Y Sensitive environment

Has any intake, fishery, or recreational area been closed? (y/n/u) N

Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest surface water contamination at or downstream of a target? (y/n/u) N

Does any target warrant sampling? (y/n/u) If yes: N
- N Drinking water intake
- N Fishery
- N Sensitive environment

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY INTAKE(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Intakes:

None identified.

Ref: 7,8,15,21
continued -------

continued -------

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY FISHERY(IES) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Fisheries:

No primary fisheries identified. The Charles River flows past the site 2000 feet to the northeast. It can be used as a fishery, but is connected to the site only by storm drains.

Ref: 7,8,11,15,21

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENT(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Sensitive Environments:

No primary sensitive environments identified. The remnant wetland of Silver Lake is not on the property, and is separated from most of the source areas by a paved parking lot.

Ref: 1,8,20,21,23

SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/n)	Yes	
Distance to surface water (feet):	100	12,23
Flood frequency (years):	>500	17
What is the downstream distance (miles) to:		
a. the nearest drinking water intake?	0.0	4,15
b. the nearest fishery?	0.4	11,18
c. the nearest sensitive environment?	0.0	12,23

LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
1. SUSPECTED RELEASE	550		
2. NO SUSPECTED RELEASE		0	
LR =	550	0	

Drinking Water Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. Determine the water body type, flow (if applicable), and number of people served by each drinking water intake.			
4. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		
5. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION Are any intakes part of a blended system? (y/n): N	0	0	
6. NEAREST INTAKE	0	0	
7. RESOURCES	5	0	
T =	5	0	

Drinking Water Threat Target Populations

Intake Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Population Served	Ref.	Value
None					

Total Primary Target Population Value	0
Total Secondary Target Population Value	0

*** Note : Maximum of 6 Intakes Are Printed ***

Apportionment Documentation for a Blended System

None identified.

Ref: 7,8,15,21

Human Food Chain Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
8. Determine the water body type and flow for each fishery within the target limit.			
9. PRIMARY FISHERIES	0		
10. SECONDARY FISHERIES	210	0	
T =	210	0	

Human Food Chain Threat Targets

Fishery Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Ref.	Value
1 Charles River	N	>100-1000 cfs	11,24	12
2 Boston Harbor	N	Coastal,ocean,Gr.Lake	18,19	12

Total Primary Fisheries Value	0
Total Secondary Fisheries Value	210

*** Note : Maximum of 6 Fisheries Are Printed ***

Environmental Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
11. Determine the water body type and flow (if applicable) for each sensitive environment.			
12. PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTS	0		
13. SECONDARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	25	0	
T =	25	0	

Environmental Threat Targets

Sensitive Environment Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Ref.	Value
1 Silver Lake/Wetland	N	<10 cfs	12,23	25

Total Primary Sensitive Environments Value	0
Total Secondary Sensitive Environments Value	25

*** Note: Maximum of 6 Sensitive Environments Are Printed ***

Surface Water Pathway Threat Scores

Threat	Likelihood of Release(LR) Score	Targets(T) Score	Pathway Waste Characteristics (WC) Score	Threat Score LR x T x WC / 82,500
Drinking Water	550	5	18	1
Human Food Chain	550	210	18	25
Environmental	550	25	18	3

SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORE: 29

Soil Exposure Pathway Criteria List
Resident Population

Is any residence, school, or daycare facility on or within 200 feet of an area of suspected contamination? (y/n/u)	Y
Is any residence, school, or daycare facility located on adjacent land previously owned or leased by the site owner/operator? (y/n/u)	N
Is there a migration route that might spread hazardous substances near residences, schools, or daycare facilities? (y/n/u)	N
Have onsite or adjacent residents or students reported adverse health effects, exclusive of apparent drinking water or air contamination problems? (y/n/u)	N
Does any neighboring property warrant sampling? (y/n/u)	N
Other criteria? (y/n)	N
RESIDENT POPULATION IDENTIFIED? (y/n)	Y

Summarize the rationale for Resident Population:

There are several (3-4) residences within 200 feet of the Mill Building and the nearest is 50 feet west, next to the parking lot. Although most of the site is paved, there is open soil in landscaping in front of the building and a small wetland at the rear of the building (north). There are 320 employees on the property and 200 in the Mill Building itself who may be exposed to any conaminants that remain in the landscaped soil areas.

Ref: 8,13,23

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics		Ref.
Do any people live on or within 200 ft of areas of suspected contamination? (y/n)	Yes	8
Do any people attend school or daycare on or within 200 ft of areas of suspected contamination? (y/n)	No	15
Is the facility active? (y/n):	Yes	13

LIKELIHOOD OF EXPOSURE	Suspected Contamination	References
1. SUSPECTED CONTAMINATION LE =	550	

Targets

2. RESIDENT POPULATION 12 resident(s) 0 school/daycare student(s)	120	3,8,23
3. RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL	50	
4. WORKERS 101 - 1000	10	13
5. TERRES. SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTS	0	
6. RESOURCES	5	
T =	185	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

WC = 18

RESIDENT POPULATION THREAT SCORE: 22

NEARBY POPULATION THREAT SCORE: 2

Population Within 1 Mile: 10,001 - 50,000

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE: 24

Soil Exposure Pathway Terrestrial Sensitive Environments

Terrestrial Sensitive Environment Name	Reference	Value
None		

Total Terrestrial Sensitive Environments Value

*** Note : Maximum of 7 Sensitive Environments Are Printed ***

Air Pathway Criteria List
Suspected Release

Are odors currently reported? (y/n/u)	N
Has release of a hazardous substance to the air been directly observed? (y/n/u)	N
Are there reports of adverse health effects (e.g., headaches, nausea, dizziness) potentially resulting from migration of hazardous substances through the air? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical/circumstantial evidence suggest release to air? (y/n/u)	N
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	N

Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:

None identified.

Ref: 1,7,8,21

AIR PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/n)	No	
Distance to the nearest individual (feet):	5	13

LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
1. SUSPECTED RELEASE	0		
2. NO SUSPECTED RELEASE		500	
LR =	0	500	

Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		
4. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION	0	162	
5. NEAREST INDIVIDUAL	0	20	
6. PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0		
7. SECONDARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0	2	
8. RESOURCES	0	5	
T =	0	190	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS		
WC =	0	18

AIR PATHWAY SCORE:	21

Air Pathway Secondary Target Populations

Distance Categories	Population	References	Value
Onsite	320	13	52
Greater than 0 to 1/4 mile	946	3,14	13
Greater than 1/4 to 1/2 mile	2898	3,14	9
Greater than 1/2 to 1 mile	12900	3,14	26
Greater than 1 to 2 miles	53768	3,14	27
Greater than 2 to 3 miles	80584	3,14	12
Greater than 3 to 4 miles	102826	3,14	23
		Total Secondary Population Value	162

Air Pathway Primary Sensitive Environments

Sensitive Environment Name	Reference	Value
None		
Total Primary Sensitive Environments Value		

*** Note : Maximum of 7 Sensitive Environments Are Printed***

Air Pathway Secondary Sensitive Environments

Sensitive Environment Name	Distance	Reference	Value
1 Silver Lake	0 - 1/4	12,24	2.5
Total Secondary Sensitive Environments Value			2

SITE SCORE CALCULATION	SCORE
GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	20
SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	29
SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE:	24
AIR PATHWAY SCORE:	21
SITE SCORE:	24

SUMMARY

1. Is there a high possibility of a threat to any nearby drinking water well(s) by migration of a hazardous substance in ground water? No

   If yes, identify the well(s).

   If yes, how many people are served by the threatened well(s)? 0

2. Is there a high possibility of a threat to any of the following by hazardous substance migration in surface water?
   A. Drinking water intake — No
   B. Fishery — No
   C. Sensitive environment (wetland, critical habitat, others) — No

   If yes, identity the target(s).
   Storm drain runoff empties into the Charles River, 1/2 mile from the site.
   There is a small wetland, a remnant of Silver Lake immediately adjacent to the site.

3. Is there a high possibility of an area of surficial contamination within 200 feet of any residence, school, or daycare facility? Yes

   If yes, identify the properties and estimate the associated population(s)
   There are several residences (4 homes) in the vicinity of what remains of Silver Lake, that is, a small wetland.

4. Are there public health concerns at this site that are not addressed by PA scoring considerations? Yes

   If yes, explain:
   There is no mechanism to gauge the potential threat stemming from a deep (150 feet) bedrock well that is contaminated and is onsite.

REFERENCE LIST

1. CDM, 1984a, Letter report from Dr. Richard Hughto, Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc. to Ms. Laurie Burt, Esq, Foley, Hoag and Eliot, Summary of Field Studies at the TRW Facility, Newton, MA, August 13, 1984."

2. DOH: Newton, 1992, Department of Health, City of Newton, Well List: July 28, 1992.

3. MA Census, 1991, Summary of Population and Housing Characteristics, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990- CPH 1-23, U.S. Department of Commerce August, 1991.

4. Gabis, C., (TRCC), 1992a, Project Note: Groundwater users within four miles of Ucinite Corp/DOT corp., October, 10, 1992

5. Gabis, C., (TRCC), 1992b, Telecon with Joe Duggan, Wellesley Public Works Dept., RE: Locations of municipal wells and the number of customers, October 5, 1992.

6. Reilly, P., 1991, Telecon between Paul Reilly, NUS/FIT and Mr. Joe Duggan, Wellesley Public Works Dept.,RE: Wellhead Protection Zones, August 13, 1991.

7. Fitzgerald, J., 1984, Preliminary Assessment, TRW DOT Site, CERCLIS #: MAD001032671, 459 Watertown St., Newton, MA 02159, Conducted by Mr. john Fitzgerald, MA DEQE, July 10, 1984.

8. Johnson, Stephen, 1984, Memorandum for the Record, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, DEQE, Subject: Newton-TRW, DOT Division, August 27, 1984.

9. Abramo, R. , CECOS International, Inc., 1983, Letter report with enclosures, to Mr. Dennis Borsuk, TRW Carr Division, RE: Report on Decontamination at TRW's Fastener Division, August 30, 1983.

10. CDM, 1984b, Letter from Dr. Richard Hughto, Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., to Mr. St. Johnson, MADEQE, RE: Former TRW Site, Newton, Massachusetts, November 14, 1984.

11. Gabis, C., (TRCC), 1992b, Telecon with Bob Zimmerman, Charles River Watershed Association, RE: Water Quality and uses of the Charles River October 21, 1992.

12. Weston Geophysical, Inc., 1984, Geophysical Survey, TRW Site, Newton, Massachusetts, August 1, 1984.

13. Gabis, C., (TRCC), 1992c, Telecon with Mr. Joseph Biotti, RE: Number of people working at Ucinite/DOT site, November 3, 1992.

14. Gabis, C., (TRCC), 1992d, Project Note: Number of people living within a four mile radius of the Ucinite Corp./ DOT corp property, October 11, 1992.

15. USGS, 1987, Boston South topographic quadrangle map, 7.5 x 15 minute metic series, 1:25000, U.S. Geologic Survey, photorevised 1987.

16. Zen, E-An, 1983, Bedrock Geologic Map of Massachusetts, E-An Zen editor, U.S. Geologic Survey, 1:250000.

17. FEMA, 1986, Flood Insurance Rate Map, City of Newton, Massachusetts, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1986.

18. Gabis, C., (TRCC), 1992e, Telecon with Mr Yunus: Division of Fish and Wildlife, Northeast District, RE: Classification and use of Charles River for fishing.

19. NWI, 1977a, National Wetlands Inventory Map, Boston South Quadrangle, U.S. Department of the Interior, April, 1977, 1:62500.

20. NWI, 1977b, National Wetlands Inventory Map, Newton Quadrangle, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1:62500, April, 1977.

21. Johnson, S., 1984, Site Inspection at TRW DOT division, CERCLIS #: MAD001032671, conducted by Stephen Johnson of Mass. DEQE, August 17, 1984.

22. Brouillet, D., (TRCC), 1992, Telecon with employee, Waltham Water Dept., RE: Locations of private wells in Waltham, October, 1992.

23. Jung/Brannen Associates, Repoort on Mill building: 459 Watertown Street, Newton, Massachusetts, perpared for TRW Foundation by Jung/ Brannen Associates: Architects and Planners, June 30, 1983.

24. UGSG, 1990, Water Resources Data, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, Water Year 1990, U.S. Geolgical Survey, Water Data Report MA-RI-90-1.